

**SR 161 Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3
Eatonville Elementary School Library – June 10, 2003
Meeting Summary**

Attendees:

Barb Lemay
Bobbi Allison
Steve Lind
Mark Kask

Jim Halmo
Rosana Hefley
Harold Hefley
Shawn Phelps

Phillip Beach
Sandi Anderson
Mary Sherman

Staff:

John Donahue
Vicki Steigner
Katie Hesterberg

Introductions:

The meeting began at 6:00 pm. John Donahue asked the meeting attendees to introduce themselves and state their interest or organization represented. Then the staff members were introduced.

Review Vision, Goals and Objectives:

Vicki Steigner presented a poster and handouts showing the draft vision, goals, and objectives as written and brainstormed at the last meeting. The committee added several things (partially based on the Eatonville and Graham vision statements) before officially adopting them. To Goal A, the committee members added the following objective: “ensure the use of constant and uniform highway standards.” For Goal B, they changed the 4th objective to read “Promote the use and development of alternate modes of transportation (both motorized and non-motorized) through cooperation with other agencies whenever possible.” They changed Goal C to read: “Preserve the integrity of the distinctive rural landscape.” The vision, goals, and objectives were adopted with a majority thumbs up vote and 2 members refrained from voting.

Criteria:

John Donahue presented a proposal for a set of criteria by which corridor improvements would be evaluated. The criteria are designed to provide a rating showing how well a proposal meets the goals and objectives. The criteria presented included:

- ?? Goal A (safety) - design standards, identified issues, accesses
- ?? Goal B (travel time) - level of service
- ?? Goal C (landscape) – environmental impacts, consistency with other plans
- ?? Goal D (serve community) – grant funding, cost/benefit

Scoring on each criteria ranged between 0 and 5 or –5 and 5 depending on the type of question being raised there. See attachment for details. The committee members added one criteria question of their own relating to Goal B: “Does the alternative accommodate both motorized and non-motorized travel?” and gave it a rating



scale from -5 to 5. There was some controversy about the wording of the question and the rating scale. The committee members adopted all of the Criteria with a thumbs up vote.

2022 Traffic Projections:

Level of Service (LOS) has to do with how well the traffic flows on the route, how crowded it is, and how much delay vehicles experience behind other vehicles and at intersections. It is represented by letters A (best LOS) through F (worst LOS). WSDOT has determined an LOS goal for all routes in the state highway system. For rural routes like this one, the current LOS goal is C.

John reviewed the existing (2002) LOS on SR 161, which is adequate except on hills where slow trucks impede traffic. Then he presented the 2022 projected LOS, which is mostly in the low to mid “D” range (except for hills) between Eatonville and Kapowsin Highway. North of Kapowsin Highway, LOS was found to be more in the high “D” and E range. See attachment for more information. John suggested that adding passing lanes (or another alternative) might be just effective as adding two more lanes, based on the forecasted LOS.

A map was used to illustrate congestion at intersections, where the most problems are forecasted for 2022. Certain turning movements at various intersections have a LOS of E or F. These are specific locations where improvements should be proposed.

Route Jurisdiction Transfer Process:

Stevan Gorcester, from the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) came as a guest to speak about the route jurisdiction process. He explained that TIB is the agency that gets state gas tax funds to the local agencies, partly in the form of grants, to use for things like sidewalk projects. The process to apply for a route jurisdiction change is as follows:

1. A request is made by one of the affected jurisdictions (WSDOT, city or county)
2. TIB initiates an investigation that compiles information relevant to the case.
3. TIB reports their findings to the public and affected agencies, and their comments are also documented.
4. Based on their research and collected comments, TIB makes a recommendation to the legislature about whether the transfer should move forward.

The transfer is considered by the legislative transportation committee. If approved, it is forwarded for final approval of by the state legislature.

Design Standards and Deviations:

A presentation about design standards was delayed until the next meeting. Two handouts were briefly presented for the committee’s review on that topic.

Next Meeting:

Scheduling and format for the June public meetings were briefly discussed, and committee members were encouraged to participate. These meetings were described as the opportunity for all stakeholders and members of the public to submit ideas about their preferred improvements to solve projected corridor problems. No Stakeholder committee meeting was scheduled for July. A meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, August 12th, at the same location and time.

